



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,345	07/31/2000	Anand C. Burman	U 012858-1	5580

140 7590 02/12/2003

LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

EXAMINER

MOHAMED, ABDEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1653

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/630,345

Applicant(s)

BURMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Abdel A. Mohamed

Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2002 and 10 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 12.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1653

DETAILED ACTION

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF AMENDMENTS, REMARKS AND STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

1. The amendments and remarks filed 10/28/02 and 2/10/03 are acknowledged, entered and considered. In view of Applicant's request claims 1-2 and 7-9 have been amended and claims 14-27 have been added. Thus, claims 1-27 are now pending in the application. The objection to trademarks, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment and remarks filed 10/28/02.

The followings are new grounds of rejections

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTIONS

HEADINGS FOR NONSTATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1653

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

DOUBLE PATENTING-NONSTATUTORY WITH A PATENT

3. Claims 1-27 are rejected under the under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,492,330.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is set forth in the '330 patent claims. *Common to both*
The patent and the application claim common subject matter, as follows: The instantly claimed invention and the patent claim the use of peptides individually or in combination for the treatment of cancer. The only difference between the '330 patent claims and the claims of the instant application is the scope of the claims in which the instantly claimed invention is limited to peptidic sequences of SEQ ID NOS:1-7, wherein "X" recited in sequence of claim 1 is replaced by alkanoyl groups while the '330 patent claims is broadly directed to peptidic sequences of SEQ ID NOS:1-25 and the peptides are further used for treating angiogenesis. Both inventions are basically the same since they are made by the same procedure for the same

Art Unit: 1653

purpose. Nevertheless, the only difference between the two inventions is the scope of the claims in which the invention of the instantly claimed invention appears to be specific in scope than that of the '330 patent which is broader because the patent's claims encompasses the use of peptidic sequences of SEQ ID NOS:1-25 for treatment of cancer and/or angiogenesis while the instantly claimed invention claims only the use of peptidic sequences of SEQ ID NOS:1-7 for treatment of cancer. Further, the instantly claimed invention is more specific in that the sequence recited in claim 1 could be replaced by any of alkanoyl groups recited in claim 2. However, one skilled in the art would easily replace any of the alkanoyl groups recited in claim 2 for the intended purpose of protecting the peptide of interest. Thus, since both inventions are directed substantially to peptides isolated from the same source for the same purposes; it is conventional and would be within the purview of ordinary skill in the art to use or adapt either the broader scope or the specific because both procedures use substantially the same peptides for the same purposes. Therefore, both inventions are an obvious variation of the other since the same peptides are used for the same purpose, and as such, one of ordinary skill in the art would envision both sets of claims as one invention and obvious variation of each other.

PROVISIONAL REJECTION OF OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

4. Claims 1-27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 4 and 32-36 of copending Application No. 09/248,381. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they

Art Unit: 1653

are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed invention (Serial No. 09/630,345) is directed to use of peptides individually or in combination for the treatment of cancer having peptidic SEQ ID NOS:1-7. Similarly, Serial No. 09/630,345 is directed to the use of peptides individually or in combination for the treatment of cancer having peptidic sequences of SEQ ID NOS:1-9, wherein at least one of the amino acids at position 1-8 is replaced by Deg in SEQ ID NO:1. Both inventions are basically the same since they are made by the same procedure for the same purpose. Nevertheless, the only difference between the two inventions is the replacement of the sequences and the numbers of sequences disclosed. In the instant application SEQ ID NOS:1-7 have been disclosed while in copending application the peptidic sequences disclosed are SEQ ID NOS:1-9. With respect to the replacement of sequences, the sequence recited in claim 1 of the instant application the "X" could be replaced by the alkanoyl groups while SEQ ID NO:1 in claim 1 of the copending application could be replaced by Deg at least in one of the amino acid position 1-8. However, one skilled in the art would easily replace any of the alkanoyl groups recited in claim 2 of the instant application for the purpose of protecting the peptide thereof or by the SEQ ID NO:1 in claim 1 of copending application at least one of the amino acid positions 1-8 of SEQ ID NO:1 by Deg (α - α -diethyl glycine) for the intended purpose of making the peptide more stable and resistant to enzymatic degradation. Thus, since both inventions are directed substantially to peptides isolated from the same source for the same purposes; it is conventional and would be within the purview of ordinary skill in the art to use or adapt either the alkanoyl groups or the Deg replacement because both procedures use

Art Unit: 1653

substantially the same peptides for the same purposes. Therefore, both inventions are an obvious variation of the other since the same peptides are used for the same purpose, and as such, one of ordinary skill in the art would envision both sets of claims as one invention and obvious variation of each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE CORRESPONDENCE

5. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdel A. Mohamed whose telephone number is (703) 308-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 5:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached on (703) 308-2923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

AM Mohamed/AAM

February 7, 2003

Christopher S. F. Low
CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600